DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 506 EA 014 052

AUTHOR Knoop, Robert
TITLE Job Involvement of Teachers.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Toledo, OH, October 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Job Satisfaction; Principals; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Motivation; *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Job Involvement; Ontario

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between job involvement and three sets of variables: nine personal (age, sex, marital status, education, overall experience, nonteaching experience, present school experience, income, and locus of control), three structural (size of school, location of school, and hierarchical position), and eight job factors (overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with coworkers, participation in decision-making, job motivation, closeness of supervision, consideration, and initiating structures). Data were obtained from 838 elementary and 975 secondary teachers in Ontario. Although bivariate correlations generally supported the hypothesized predictions, multiple regression analysis indicated that involvement is mainly related to three variables: job motivation, job satisfaction, and marital status. Three other variables--participation in decision-making, educational level, and satisfaction with supervision--were only significantly related to involvement for secondary teachers. The independent variables explained about 22 percent of the variance in job involvement for elementary teachers and 29 percent for secondary teachers. When the results were analyzed by sets of variables, it was found that job factors were the only ones related to involvement for both samples. The results are discussed and compared with earlier findings and implications for future research are suggested. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208508

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JOB INVOLVEMENT OF TEACHERS

Paper Presented to the

Mid-Western Educational Research Association

Toledo, Ohio

October 1980

Robert Knoop, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor,
Educational Administration,
Brock University,
St. Catharines, Ontario.

EA 013 052

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Knoop
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between job involvement and three sets of variables: 9 personal, 3 structural and 8 job factors. Data were obtained from 838 elementary and 975 secondary teachers employed by 32 school boards in Ontario, Canada. Bivariate correlations generally supported the hypothesized predictions. However, multiple regression analysis indicated that involvement of teachers is mainly related to three variables: job motivation, job satisfaction, and marital status. Three other variables--participation in decision making, educational level, and satisfaction with supervision--were only significantly related to involvement for secondary teachers. The independent variables explained about 22% of the variance in job involvement for elementary teachers and 29% for secondary teachers. When the results were analyzed by sets of variables, it was found that, for both samples, only job factors, but not personal and structural factors, were related to involvement. The results are discussed and compared with earlier findings, and implications for future research are suggested.

JOB INVOLVEMENT OF TEACHERS

Rabinowitz & Hall's[1] major review of the literature on job involvement has given organization theorists a framework to guide future research on this concept. While Saal,[2] using similar variables, generally supported Rabinowitz & Hall's profile of a job involved person, McKelvey & Sekaran,[3] using a different set of variables, advocated a career-based theory of job involvement. One of the objectives of the present research was to ascertain if elementary and secondary school teachers differ from other segments of the workforce.

Arguments among researchers analyzing this variable are centered around three basic questions: (1) are there significant differences between individuals with high and low levels of job involvement and specific personal, structural, and job-related variables; (2) which of the specific variables from all categories account for most of the variance in job involvement; and (3) which of the three categories of variables is the best predictor of job involvement. To investigate these questions and to contribute further to an overallconceptual framework of job involvement was the second objective of this study.

Job involvement seems to be both a cause and an effect of job behavior and is viewed from a theoretical perspective as "an individual difference variable, as a situationally determined variable, and as a person-situation interaction variable".[4] The concept is defined by Lodahl & Kejner[5] in three ways: as the extent to which self esteem is affected by performance; as the

importance of work to a person's self image; and as psychological identification with one's work. The last two parts have to do with "the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the person".[6] Because value orientations are learned, individuals differ in the degree of involvement in their work, that is, in the degree to which work is perceived as an important part of life. There are therefore two distinct dimensions to the involvement of a person in a job: the performance-self esteem contingency and the self component concept.[7] Lodahl & Kejner's definition relates to both of these dimensions. Since most studies investigating job involvement have used the scale developed by these authors, a competing operationalized definition does not exist to clarify the definitional multidimensionality. It appears that clarification of the concept is dependent on future theoretical synthesis of those variables found significantly associated with job involvement based on a variety of measuring instruments. Lack of definitional clarity may also account for the absence of theories on which hypotheses investigating job involvement can be based.

The hypothesized relationships in Table 1 are based on the summary of correlates of job involvement reviewed by Rabinowitz & Hall, on studies not included in their summary, and on studies published since. The results of the twelve studies found in this way lend general support to Rabinowitz & Hall's summary of correlates and will only be briefly summarized.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Concerning personal factors, significant correlations were reported for job involvement and age (McKelvey & Sekaran,[8] Stevens, et al.,[9] Saal,[10] Newman[11]), sex (Saal,[12] Hollon & Gemmill,[13] Newman[14]), education (Saal,[15] Stevens, et al.[16]), tenure (Newman[17]), salary (Bigoness[18]), and locus of control (Kimmons & Greenhaus[19], Reitz & Jewell[20]); non-significant correlations were found for age (Bigoness[21]), sex (Stevens, et al.[22]), marital status (Saal[23]), tenure, defined as number of years in present position (Stevens, et al.[24], McKelvey & Sekaran[25]), salary (Saal[26]), and locus of control (Bigoness[27]).

Seven studies dealt with the relationship of job involvement and job factors. Significant relationships were found for job satisfaction (Brief & Aldag[28], Herman, et al.[29]), satisfaction with supervision (Saal[30], Newman[31], Herman, et al.[32]), satisfaction with coworkers (Saal[33], Newman[34], Herman, et al.[35]), job motivation (Saal[36], Newman[37]), consideration (Herman, et al.[38], Newman[39]), and initiating structure (Brief, et al.[40], Herman, et al.[41]); non-significant results were reported for both satisfaction with supervision and with coworkers (Bigoness[42], Abdel-Halim[43]), consideration (Brief & Aldag[44], Brief, et al.[45]), initiating structure (Brief & Aldag[46]), and closeness of supervision, expressed as percentage of supervision (Stevens, et al.[47]).

With regard to structural factors, only one variable was investigated: organization size was not found to be related to job involvement (Stevens, et al.[48]).

In an effort to explain a greater proportion of the variance

in job involvement, two factors not previously investigated and two factors included in only one other study were incorporated into the present study. Job involvement was hypothesized to be correlated with school size and location, with the degree to which teachers are subjected to occupational supervision, and with number of years of non-related job experience. It was hoped that knowledge of such possible relationships would increase our understanding of the job involvement concept.

The correlates of job involvement, their means and standard deviations, and the strength of the expected relationships based on previous empirical research are stated in Table 1.

METHODOLOGY

SUBJECTS AND DATA COLLECTION

Subjects were elementary and secondary teachers employed by 32 school boards in Ontario, Canada. Of 2,000 questionnaires distributed, 1,813 usable forms (91%) were returned; of these, 838 were collected from elementary teachers (Gr. K to 8) and 975 from secondary teachers (Gr. 9 to 13). Characteristics of both samples pertaining to age, sex, marital status, education, overall experience, non-teaching experience, experience in present school, income (1979), school size, location of school and hierarchical position of participants are given in Table 1.

Respondents were engaged in all aspects of teaching, from primary to senior grades in elementary schools, and from arts, communication, social science and pure science subject areas in secondary schools. Data were collected by members of a research team composed of part-time graduate students in education. In some instances entire school populations were sampled; in other cases educators at educational conferences were asked to complete the survey form. An effort was made to secure a high response rate whenever sets of questionnaires were distributed.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Job Involvement. A job involvement score was computed from responses to a six-item scale developed by Lodahl & Kejner[49]. The response categories were scored from "1" (strongly agree) to "5" (strongly disagree) with a possible range of scores from 6 to 30. Scoring was reversed for one negatively-worded item.

Low scores indicated a high degree of job involvement. Batlis, using a similar shortform of the job involvement instrument, reported a split-half reliability of .81. The short version was administered to a sample of educators by Hollon & Gemmill[50] who cited an internal reliability coefficient of .93. The test-retest reliability investigated in the present study (.72) can be considered acceptable.

Locus of Control. *An eleven-item abbreviated version of Rotter's (1966)[51] I-E scale (Valecha, 1972[52]) was used to measure the internal-external dimension of personality. Item selection was based on the rationale that each statement is general, adult and workrelated. Item format was forced choice; each choice received a score of either 0 or 1. The scores ranged from 0, most internal, to 10, most external. The test-retest reliability (.67) seems adequate.

Overall Job Satisfaction. A four-item index developed by Hoppock[53] was utilized to measure job satisfaction. A seven-part response mode for each question yielded a range of scores between 4 and 28. McNichols, et al.[54], confirmed the scale's adequacy in terms of construct, convergent and concurrent validity and in terms of reliability. The test-retest reliability coefficient of .71 compares favorably with that given by McNichols, et al.[55], who quote a range of .67 to .81.

Satisfaction with Supervision and Coworkers. These two dimensions were used as global measures of respondents' reactions to the style of management under which they worked and to their relationship with fellow educators. The statements were taken

from Aitkin & Hage's[56] scale of alienation from expressive relations which consists of two questions with a four-point Likert-type response format (Lislow, 4 is high): "How satisfied are you with your fellow workers?". The test-retest reliability coefficients (.41 and .48) are rather low.

Participation in Decision Making. Siegel & Ruh's[57] five-item scale (alpha = .81) was used to measure participation in decision making. A five-point Likert-type response mode resulted in a minimum score of 5 (very little participation) and a maximum score of 25 (very much participation). Test-retest reliability (.70) is adequate.

Job Motivation. The measure of job motivation, defined as the level of aroused motivation on the job from the standpoint of devotion of energy to job tasks, was Patchen's[58] Index B which consists of four five-point Likert scales. Responses were summed, resulting in a maximum score of 20 for high motivation and a minimum score of 4 for low motivation. The test-retest reliability coefficient of .70 was lower than that reported by Patchen (.80).

Closeness of Supervision. A three-item scale was used to measure closeness of supervision (Pearlin & Kohn[59]), or the degree of occupational supervision to which a person is subject. Item format was a five-point Likert-type scale which resulted in a minimum score of 5 and a maximum score of 15; the lower the total score, the closer the supervision.

Consideration and Initiating Structure. The two leadership dimensions were measured with the ten-item modified Form XII of

the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) as described by Schriesheim & Kerr[60]. Responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree on a five-point scale with a response range from 5 to 25 for each dimension; the lower the score the more the supervisor was perceived to engage in behavior characterized by high consideration and/or high initiating structure. Scores were reversed for (two) negatively phrased items. The test-retest reliabilities of .55 for consideration and .67 for initiating structure are not as high as those reported by Greene[61](.57 to .72 for structure and .71 to .79 for consideration).

Demographic Variables. Demographic variables measured were age, sex (male = 1; female = 2), marital status (single = 1; married = 2; divorced = 3), education (no degree = 1; bachelor = 2; master or doctor = 3), overall experience, non-teaching experience (non = 1; one year or more = 2), experience in present school, income (under $15,000 = 1, $15,000 to $20,000 = 2; $20,000 to $25,000 = 3; over $25,000 = 4), size of school (20 teachers or less = 1; 21 to 60 teachers = 2; over 60 teachers = 3), location of school (metropolitan area = 1; suburban area = 2; small city = 3, rural area = 4), and hierarchical position (teacher = 1; department head = 2; principal or vice-principal = 3).

RESULTS

Simple Correlations

The intercorrelation matrix of all variables investigated is given in Table 2. The results show that of the 16 hypothesized relationships between three sets of variables and job involvement, 9 were significant ($p = .05$) for the elementary, and 13 for the secondary teacher sample. Four of the significant correlates (education, years of experience in present school, hierarchical position, and satisfaction with coworkers) are therefore clearly different for each sample group.

Of the personal factors, only locus of control and marital status were moderately correlated with job involvement for both groups of teachers. While we predicted that internals would be more job involved than externals, married educators were expected to be as involved in their job as either single or divorced teachers. Surprisingly, age did not correlate with job involvement for any of the sample groups: younger teachers were as job involved as older teachers. Similarly, correlations with sex, tenure (overall teaching experience) and income were inconsistent with previous findings: for both sample groups, male and female teachers, experienced and inexperienced teachers, and highly and poorly paid teachers were equally involved in their work. Education and years of experience in present school were moderately correlated with job involvement for secondary teachers only.

Only one of the structural factors was significantly correlated with job involvement: secondary school principals and

department heads were generally more involved in their job than their teachers; this moderate correlation did not hold for the elementary-educator sample. Furthermore, teachers in small, rural schools were not more job involved than those in large, suburban or city schools.

All but one of the job factors were, as predicted, significantly related to job involvement, for both sample groups. Educators who were highly involved in their job were also highly satisfied with their job and with their supervisors. Those who felt they participated in decision making reported a high degree of job involvement as did those who were highly motivated. Closeness of supervision was inversely related to job involvement: the less closely teachers were supervised, the higher was their degree of job involvement. Either leadership dimension--consideration or initiating structure--as long as it was pronounced (high) was significantly correlated with job involvement. Satisfaction with coworkers was the only job factor that showed a non-significant correlation with job involvement for elementary school educators.

Multiple Regression Analysis

To determine those specific variables which most strongly influence job involvement, multiple regression analyses were performed for both sample groups with job involvement as the dependent variable and the twenty personal, structural, and job factors as independent variables (see Table 3). Though only statistically significant results are presented, some non-significant predictor variables are given for comparison

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Several important findings emerge from the regression analyses. For the elementary sample, three of the variables entered the equation of the step-wise analysis at a significant level, yielding an explained variance for job involvement of .22. For secondary educators, six variables entered the equation at a significant level and collectively explained 29% of the variance in job involvement. Despite the large number of independent variables, the portion of variance attributable to job involvement was relatively small. This indicates that there are other factors besides those investigated in this study which influence educators' involvement in their work.

Three factors were significantly associated with job involvement in both samples: two job factors, job motivation and overall job satisfaction, and one personal factor, marital status. Since these factors were statistically significant in both samples, one may conclude that they represent relatively stable predictors of job involvement. In contrast, participation in decision making, education, and satisfaction with supervision were only significantly related to job involvement in the sample of secondary school teachers where they explained a small percentage (4%) of total variance.

It can be seen that several factors were significantly related to job involvement when simple r was used but were not significant under multiple regression analysis. These factors are, for the elementary sample: locus of control ($r = .06$), satisfaction with supervision ($r = -.10$), participation in decision making ($r = -.15$), closeness of supervision ($r = -.09$), consideration ($r = .11$), and initiating structure ($r = .06$). For the secondary panel these

factors were: experience in present school (r = .06), locus of control (r = .09), hierarchical position (r = .05), satisfaction with coworkers (r = .07), closeness of supervision (r = -.22), consideration (r = .23), and initiating structure (r = .15). These zero-order correlations are indications of common method variance (self reports) and suggest an underlying correlation among the independent variables. This variance is reduced, but not eliminated, in multivariate analysis, the independent (predictor) variables are therefore not likely to be significantly correlated even though correlated error variance cannot be altogether eliminated.

Finally, to determine which category of factors, rather than which individual factor, was most strongly associated with job involvement, separate multiple regression analyses were performed for each of the three sets of factors for both samples.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

The results in Table 4 reveal that, for both samples, only job factors related significantly to job involvement. Neither personal nor structural factors, when classified into categories, seem to have a significant influence on the involvement of teachers in their job.

DISCUSSION

Because of the multiplicity of variables investigated, discussion of the results will be limited to major findings on the nature of job involvement. First, of all the variables investigated only three withstood the rigour of multiple regression analysis for both sample groups even though nine factors were significant under bivariate correlation. It is therefore quite likely that many of the weak and moderate correlations reported in previous studies are due to spurious relationships.

Secondly, the results of the present study support Rabinowitz & Hall's[62] notion of considering job involvement a feedback variable. Involvement may be high because a person is satisfied with, or motivated by, his or her job; or a person may experience high job satisfaction, or job mutivation, because of high job involvement. It is also possible, so far unexplored, that these three variables (job involvement, job satisfaction, job motivation) are synchronistically related: if one of these variables is high it may be likely that the other two are also high. Can one not expect people who are involved in their job to be also motivated and satisfied?

Thirdly, the findings also support Rabinowitz & Hall's claim that "much of the variance in job involvement remains unexplained".[63] Overall, the amount of variance explained by the 20 variables in the present study (R^2 = .22 and .29) is similar to the variance explained by Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale[64] who cite an R^2 value of .27 for 9

variables. Yet, two other studies published since report a higher portion of explained variance. McKelvey & Sekaran[65] quote an R^2 value of .38 for 49 variables, and Saal[66] quotes an R^2 of .15 for 10 personal demographic variables, an R^2 of .27 for 10 situational job variables, and an R^2 of .36 for (the N is not clear) personal-psychological variables. Saal warns, however, that his results may be inflated and based on correlated error variance. If one compares the R^2 for age of Saal[67] (.09) with Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale's[68] (.01) and this study's (.001), this warning receives support.

Fourthly, the results give support to Saal's contention, rather than to Rabinowitz and Hall's conclusion: personal factors did not show as strong a relationship to job involvement as did job factors. A larger portion of variance was attributable to the nine job factors than to an equal number of personal factors.

Fifthly, based on regression analysis, the general profile of a job involved educator is easily drawn: he or she is motivated on the job, is satisfied with the job, and is predominantly single or divorced. In contrast to elementary teachers, secondary teachers who are involved in their jobs also participate in the decision-making process, are better educated and are more satisfied with their supervisor.

Some of the findings require explanations in view of the hypothesized relationships in Table 1. Marital status was not expected to have an influence on job involvement. Yet the results show that single and divorced teachers are predictably more job involved than married teachers in both sample groups. Even though

it is possible that the F-values (5.92 and 9.64) are inflated if one considers the low simple r's (.09 and .06), the findings suggest that the interests and energies of married teachers are divided. Another type of involvement, family involvement, takes up a portion of their job involvement. The personal life of single and divorced teachers does not seem to be as demanding and involving and they appear to identify more with their work. Care must be taken though not to put value judgements on this finding. We do not know what the "ideal" degree of job involvement is; it is conceivable that a very high degree of job involvement is undesirable, especially in teaching, because involvement in non-work activities may be just as important to the full personality we find desirable in teachers. Support for this contention is given by Rabinowitz & Hall who suggest that future research should examine "the possible harmful effects of overinvolvement at work".[69]

The common belief that married female teachers are responsible for the low mean scores of married educators in both samples was not upheld. A post facto test comparing job involvement of married males with married females proved non-significant: married female educators are as involved in their job as married male educators (ANOVA, F-value = .009).

No support was found for the expected strong relationship between job involvement and age. The teaching profession differs in this respect markedly from other work forces. One possible explanation for this finding is that teachers have sufficient job variety, autonomy and challenge which allow them to become involved at any age, coupled with value orientations which reflect the

importance of work they try to instill in their students. New courses, new curricula, adequate participation in decision making, experimentation with teaching methods or learning experiences are but a few examples of possibilities for initial and continuous involvement.

The simple-order correlations for participation in decision making and job involvement (.15 and .34), although significant, are not as high as those reported by Ruh, et al.[70] (.53, employees in manufacturing), White & Ruh[71] (.44 for workers and .53 for managers), Siegel & Ruh[72] (.51, employees in manufacturing) and Schuler[73] (.52, employees in manufacturing). This seems to suggest that job involvement of educators does not depend as much on participation in decision making as that of other work groups. Surprisingly, the mean scores (Table 1) indicate that elementary teachers perceive to have more influence in what goes on in their schools than secondary teachers. Yet, regression analysis shows that participation in decision making and job involvement are not significantly associated for this sample group.

Several critical questions remain regarding the concept of involvement: How many components of involvement are there? Which are the key indicators of these different types of involvement? To what exteht do these components overlap with, or complement, job involvement? How can they be best measured? To what degree is job involvement career-based? To what extent is job involvement desirable? Future research should provide answers to these questions so that job involvement can be conceptually linked to an overall theoretical framework of organizational variables.

Notes

1. S. Rabinowitz & D.T. Hall, "Organizational Research on Job Involvement", Psychological Bulletin, 84, 2 (1977) : 265-288.

2. F.E. Saal, "Job Involvement : A Multivariate Approach", Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 1 (1978) : 53-61.

3. B. McKelvey & V. Sekaran, "Toward a Career-Based Theory of Job Involvement : A Study of Scientists and Engineers", Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 2 (1977) : 281-305.

4. Rabinowitz & Hall, "Organizational Research".

5. T.M. Lodahl & M. Kejner, "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement", Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 1 (1965) : 24-33.

6. Ibid., p. 24.

7. Rabinowitz & Hall, "Organizational Research".

8. McKelvey & Sekaran, "Toward a Career-Based Theory".

9. J.M. Stevens, J.M.Beyer & H.M. Price, "Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors of Managerial Commitment", Academy of Management Journal, 21, 3 (1978) : 380-396.

10. Saal, "Job Involvement".

11. J.E. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure-Job Attitude Relationship through Perceptions of the Work Environment", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 14, 3 (1975) : 371-397.

12. Saal, "Job Involvement".

13. C.J. Hollon & G.R. Gemmill, "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors on Participation in Decision Making, Job Related Tension, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction", Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 1 (1976) : 80-93.

14. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

15. Saal, "Job Involvement".

16. Stevens, Beyer & Trice, "Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors".

17. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

18. W.J. Bigoness, "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining", Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 2 (1978) : 228-233.

19. G. Kimmons & J.H. Greenhaus, "Relationship Between Locus of Control and Reactions of Employees to Work Characteristics", Psychological Reports, 39, 1 (1976) : 815-820.

20. H.J. Reitz & L.N. Jewell, "Sex, Locus of Control, and Job Involvement : A Six-Country Investigation", Academy of Management Journal, 22, 1 (1979) : 72-80.

21. Bigoness, "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes".

22. Stevens, Beyer & Price, "Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors".

23. Saal, "Job Involvement".

24. Stevens, Beyer & Price, "Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors".

25. McKelvey & Sekaran. "Toward a Career-Based Theory of Job Involvement".

26. Saal, "Job Involvement".

27. Bigoness, "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes".

28. A.P. Brief & R.J. Aldag, "Work Values as Moderators of Perceived Leader Behavior-Satisfaction Relationships", Sociology of Work and Occupations, 4, 1 (1977) : 99-112.

29. J.B. Herman, R.B. Dunham & C.L. Hulin, "Organizational Structure, Demographic Characteristics, and Employee Responses", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 2 (1975) : 206-232.

30. Saal, "Job Involvement".

31. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

32. Herman, Dunham & Hulin, "Organizational Structure".

33. Saal, "Job Involvement".

34. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

35. Herman, Dunham & Hulin, "Organizational Structure".

36. Saal, "Job Involvement".

37. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

38. Herman, Dunham & Hulin, "Organizational Structure".

39. Newman, "Understanding the Organizational Structure".

40. A.P. Brief, R.J. Aldag & R.A. Wallden, "Correlates of Supervisory Style Among Policemen", Criminal Justice and Behavior, 3, 3 (1976) : 263-271.

41. Herman, Dunham & Hulin, "Organizational Structure".

42. Bigoness, "Correlates of Faculty Attitudes".

43. A.A. Abdel-Halim, "Individual and Interpersonal Moderators of Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics : A Reexamination", Personnel Psychology, 32, 1 (1979) : 121-137.

44. Brief & Aldag, "Work Values as Moderators".

45. Brief, Aldag & Wallden, "Correlates of Supervisory Style".

46. Brief & Aldag, "Work Values as Moderators".

47. Stevens, Beyer & Price, "Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors".

48. Ibid.

49. Lodahl & Kejner, "The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement".

50. Hollon & Gemmill, "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors".

51. J.B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versux External Control of Reinforcement", Psychological Monographs, 80, 1 (1966) : No. 609.

52. G.P. Valecha, "Construct Validation of Internal-External Locus of Reinforcement Related to Work-Related Variables:, in Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 7 (1972) : 455-456.

53. R. Hoppock, Job Satisfaction, New York, Harper & Row, 1935.

54. C.W. McNichols, J.J. Stahl & R.T. Manley, "A Validation of Hoppock's Job Satisfaction Measure", Academy of Management Journal, 21, 4 (1978) : 737:742.

55. Ibid.

56. M. Aiken & T. Hage, "Organizational Alienation : A Comparative Analysis", American Sociological Review, 31, 4 (1966) : 497-507.

57. A.L. Siegel & R.A. Ruh, "Job Involvement, Participation in Decision Making, Personal Background and Job Behavior", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9, 2 (1973) : 318-327.

58. M. Patchen, "Some Questionnaire Measures of Employee Motivation and Morale", Monograph #41, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1965.

59. L.I. Pearlin & M.L.Kohn, "Social Class, Occupation and Parental Values : A Cross-National Study", American Sociological Review, 31, 4 (1966) : 466-479.

60. C. Schriesheim & S. Kerr, "Psychometric Properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scales", Psychological Bulletin, 81, 11 (1974) : 756-765.

61. C.N. Greene, "A Longitudinal Analysis of Relationships Among Leader Behavior and Subordinate Performance and Satisfaction", Academy of Management Proceedings, 1974.

62. Rabinowitz & Hall, "Organizational Research".

63. Ibid., p. 285.

64. S. Rabinowitz, D.T. Hall & T.G. Goodale, "Job Scope and Individual Differences as Predictors of Job Involvement : Independent or Interactive?", Academy of Management Journal, 20, 2 (1977) : 273-281.

65. McKelvey & Sekaran, "Toward a Career-Based Theory of Job Involvement".

66. Saal, "Job Involvement".

67. Ibid.

68. Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale, "Job Scope and Individual Differences".

69. Rabinowitz & Hall, "Organizational Research".

70. R.A. Ruh, J.K. White & R.R. Wood, "Job Involvement, Values, Personal Background, Participation in Decision Making, and Job Attitudes", Academy of Management Journal, 18, 2 (1975) : 300-312.

71. J.K. White & R.A. Ruh, "Effects of Personal Values on the Relationship Between Participation and Job Attitudes", Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 4 (1973) : 506-514.

72. Siegel & Ruh, "Job Involvement, Participation in Decision Making".

73. R.S. Schuler, "Determinants of Job Involvement : Individual vs. Organizational : An Extension of the Literature", Paper Presented at the Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, 1975.

Table 1

Basic Statistics for All Variables

	Test-Retest Reliability (n = 36)	Elementary Teachers (n = 838) Mean	sd	Secondary Teachers (n = 975) Mean	sd	Expected Relationship with J.I. Based on Previous Research	Basis for Prediction (# of studies)
PERSONAL FACTORS							
1. Age		35.10	8.36	37.01	8.74	Strong	15
2. Sex		1.59	.49	1.33	.47	Weak/strong	4
3. Marital Status		1.84	.55	1.88	.49	None	4
4. Education		1.86	.69	2.16	.53	Weak	8
5. Experience : Overall		11.63	7.35	11.73	6.86	Weak	5
6. Non-teaching Experience		1.12	2.67	2.47	5.03	Not investigated	0
7. Experience : Present School		4.6[illegible]	4.31	6.26	4.57	None	2
8. Income		2.53	1.02	3.36	.82	Weak	2
9. Locus of Control	.67	4.49	2.27	4.23	2.44	Weak/strong	5
STRUCTURAL FACTORS							
10. Size of School		20.26	13.20	76.27	64.[illegible]	None	1
11. Location of School		2.57	1.03	2.39	.85	Not investigated	0
12. Hierarchial Position		1.45	1.13	1.53	.97	Weak	4
JOB FACTORS							
13. Overall Job Satisfaction	.7[illegible]	21.27	3.33	20.79	3.25	Strong	3
14. Satisfaction with Supervision	.41	3.12	.93	2.98	.98	Weak	9
15. Satisfaction with Coworkers	.48	3.14	.74	3.[illegible]2	.76	Weak	8
16. Part. in Decision Making	.70	18.36	3.93	17.82	3.71	Strong	4
17. Job Motivation	.70	15.10	2.63	14.93	2.53	Weak	2
18. Closeness of Supervision	.47	10.70	2.90	10.87	2.27	None	1
19. Consideration	.55	11.13	4.66	11.90	4.81	Weak	6
20. Initiating Structure	.67	11.90	4.30	12.13	4.44	Weak	6
21. Job Involvement	.72	18.16	4.22	17.95	4.24		

Table 2

Intercorrelations of Job Involvement with Groups of Personal, Structural and Job Factors

	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS (n = 838)									SECONDARY TEACHERS (n = 975)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
PERSONAL FACTORS																		
1. Age	-									-								
2. Sex	.04	-								-.18	-							
3. Marital Status	.26	.02	-							.17	-.06	-						
4. Education	-.13	-.40	-.08	-						.10	-.12	.04	-					
5. Experience : Overall	.79	-.03	.14	.00	-					.76	-.19	.12	.20	-				
6. Non-Teaching Experience	.14	-.05	.07	.04	-.02	-				.42	-.12	.08	-.20	.03	-			
7. Experience : Present School	.32	.05	.00	-.11	.43	.00	-			.47	-.14	.06	-.02	.55	.15	-		
8. Income	.32	-.39	.07	.53	.46	.02	.12	-		.49	-.30	.20	.24	.63	.04	.37	-	
9. Locus of Control	-.05	.11	-.03	-.04	-.06	.01	.02	-.15	-	-.10	.06	.00	.00	-.09	-.10	-.05	.05	-
21. Job Involvement	-.03	-.03	.09	-.02	-.03	-.02	.01	.03	.06	-.01	-.03	.06	-.06	-.01	.01	.06	.00	.09
STRUCTURAL FACTORS	10	11	12							10	11	12						
10. Size of School	-									-								
11. Location of School	-.24	-								-.18	-							
12. Hierarchial Position	.03	-.08	-							.08	-.06	-						
21. Job Involvement	.02	-.01	-.02							-.03	-.01	-.05						
JOB FACTORS	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
13. Overall Job Satisfaction	-									-								
14. Satisfaction with Supervision	.34	-								.31	-							
15. Satisfaction with Coworkers	.12	.30	-							.15	.31	-						
16. Part. in Decision Making	.47	.46	.17	-						.45	.42	.15	-					
17. Job Motivation	.53	.16	-.03	.39	-					.44	.18	.03	.35	-				
18. Closeness of Supervision	.47	.25	.10	.60	.49	-				.37	.29	.09	.64	.31	-			
19. Consideration	-.30	-.58	-.21	-.49	-.10	-.25	-			-.23	-.57	-.10	-.44	-.22	-.29	-		
20. Initiating Structure	-.20	-.42	-.13	-.20	-.10	-.06	.38	-		-.17	-.36	-.15	-.17	-.16	-.05	.32	-	
21. Job Involvement	-.34	-.10	-.04	-.15	-.41	-.09	.11	.06		-.42	-.25	-.07	-.34	-.44	-.22	.23	.15	

All correlations are Pearson product-moment correlations. When r = .05, p = .05, r = .07, p = .01, r ≥ .10, p = .001.

TABLE 3

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR SPECIFIC PERSONAL, STRUCTURAL, AND JOB FACTORS ON JOB INVOLVEMENT

Independent Variable	Elementary (N=798)		Secondary (N=927)	
	Beta	F	Beta	F
Job Motivation	.325	85.60***	.303	86.84***
Overall Job Satisfaction	.254	44.70***	.221	41.58***
Participation in Decision Mak.	.013	.08	.141	10.95**
Marital Status	0.81	5.92*	.090	9.64**
Education	.05	1.11	.075	6.41*
Satisfaction with Supervision	.02	.15	.074	3.85*
R^2 for Significant Factors	.22		.29	

* p = .05
** p = .01
*** p = .001

TABLE 4

MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PERSONAL, STRUCTURAL AND JOB FACTORS AND JOB INVOLVEMENT

Factors	Elementary (N=798)		Secondary (N=927)	
	R	F	R	F
Personal	.14	1.88	.15	2.35
Structural	.02	0.11	.06	1.29
Job	.47	27.87*	.53	44.13*

* p = .001